

**CLARK COUNTY
CLEAN WATER COMMISSION
Meeting Notes**

Wednesday, October 5, 2005

6:30 – 8:30 P.M.

Clark County Fire District #11 Meeting Room
21609 NE 72nd Ave., Battle Ground

Clark County Clean Water Commission Members Present

Tim Crawford, Robert Even, Bill Owen, Art Stubbs, Virginia van Breemen

Clark County Clean Water Commission Members Absent

Anne Jackson, Patty Page, Susan Rasmussen, Ronald Wilson

Clark County Public Works Staff

Don Andrews, Trista Kobluskie, Earl Rowell, Jim Soli, Scott Wilson

Public

None

Call to Order

Introduction

The members of the Clark County Clean Water Commission, the public, and Clark County staff were introduced. The meeting was then called to order.

Mr. Rowell welcomed Mr. Even to the Commission.

Agenda and material review

The packet includes:

1. 10/05/05 Clean Water Commission Meeting Agenda
2. 09/07/05 Clean Water Commission Meeting Notes
3. Letter from the Board of Clark County Commissioners appointing Mr. Even to the Clean Water Commission
4. Clean Water Commission Bylaws
5. Clean Water Fee Call and Correspondence Statistics for the first 15 weeks
6. Email from Rod Swanson to Earl Rowell regarding the new NPDES permit
7. Email to Mr. Stubbs and Mr. Owen regarding the departure of two Water Resources Engineers
8. *The Columbian* newspaper article on the East Fork Lewis River

Mr. Rowell also noted that item 8 from the August meeting and items 8 and 9 from the September meeting will be reviewed.



Meeting Notes

Capital Improvement Subcommittee Update

Mr. Soli reviewed the draft criteria for ranking capital improvement projects. The draft is circulating to other engineers around the county for comment.

Mr. Owen asked Mr. Soli what are the next steps to close out the process. Mr. Soli stated that the subcommittee would wait for comments. The next major step is to determine the relative weights of each of the seven criteria to each other.

Mr. Owen stated that there are two options for determining the weights: the entire Clean Water Commission can devise relative weighting, or the subcommittee can propose ideas and present them to the entire Clean Water Commission. Mr. Stubbs advocated that the subcommittee work on weighting the criteria.

The group discussed how capital projects were chosen in the past.

Mr. Soli asked the group if they would feel comfortable defending the criteria in front of the County Commissioners. Mr. Crawford answered yes.

Mr. Stubbs stated that all members of the Clean Water Commission would need to know why each capital improvement project was chosen and be able to defend the projects to the community.

Mr. Even requested to sit in on the Capital Improvements Subcommittee meetings and the group agreed.

The group appointed Ms. Kobluskie to organize meetings for the subcommittee after Mr. Soli's resignation from the county.

Public Comments

None.

New Business

North Salmon Creek/Highway 99 Stormwater Project

Mr. Andrews of Clark County Public Works is the project manager. He reviewed the completed project that added stormwater treatment to the north part of the Salmon Creek basin. Previously none of the water was being treated. Also, the outfalls were causing additional erosion to Salmon Creek. Ms. van Breemen stated that the bank of the creek has been eroding for years.

Mr. Andrews discussed the various options for treating, piping and discharging the stormwater that Public Works explored prior to completing the project.

The project includes a 99-cartridge stormwater filter vault to treat the water.



The new outfall is in an upland area that does not discharge directly to Salmon Creek. The outfall goes through two types of energy dissipaters before releasing and flowing to Salmon Creek.

Mr. Stubbs asked if the county monitored the site for water quality prior to upgrading the stormwater infrastructure. Mr. Andrews said no. He stated that Ron Wierenga of the Clean Water Program would monitor the site now that the project is completed.

Mr. Stubbs asked if the project has cleaned up Salmon Creek. Mr. Rowell responded that before the project, this area received little if any treatment for stormwater. With construction of the project, the stormwater pollution load from the area to Salmon Creek should drop by 50 percent.

Mr. Owen asked about the maintenance plan for the facility. Mr. Wilson is the Maintenance Superintendent for the Road Crew. He said that the project nearly doubled the number of filter cartridges that the county is responsible for maintaining and replacing.

Mr. Andrews and Mr. Wilson discussed the pre-sedimentation traps that are in place prior to water reaching the filter vault itself.

Mr. Owen asked if the ditches along Highway 99 are vegetated and if they might contribute to sedimentation of the filter vault. Mr. Wilson said the ditch is well-defined. Mr. Owen said he is more concerned with the ditch itself eroding and sending sediment through the stormwater system. Mr. Wilson said that the greater problem they have already noticed is organic debris from the ditches reaching the filter vault.

NPDES Maintenance Activities Update

Mr. Wilson and the group discussed the frequency of replacement for filter cartridges.

Mr. Wilson reviewed the number of miles swept in each cycle of sweeping. Sweeping occurs regularly on approximately 35-40% of county roads. Neighborhood roads are swept 9 times per year. Arterials are swept 12 times per year. Other roads are swept as needed.

Road sweepings are processed at a decant facility in Orchards where the county creates mulches and soils used in county rights of way. The facility is shared with Vancouver and the State of Washington.

Mr. Owen asked if the county tests the material swept. Mr. Wilson answered yes. Mr. Owen asked if a correlation can be made between the pollutants in the swept material and the health of county surface water. Mr. Rowell interjected that the material itself, regardless of the level of pollutants such as metals or chemicals in the material, is detrimental to the county storm sewer system; it can clog filters, fill up drywells and cause other consequences that require more frequent and more costly maintenance. Mr. Owen said it is cheaper for the county to sweep than to perform maintenance later.

Mr. Wilson said tests on sweepings are cleaner than tests on materials suctioned from catch basins and filter vaults. Mr. Stubbs asked if there is a correlation between how frequently we sweep as to how clean the sweepings are. Mr. Wilson said that prior to the NPDES the county would not be able to clean all of the catch basins in the county in one year. Now the county can easily clean all of them in one year, even with the growth in population.



Mr. Wilson said that the sweepers pick up 6,000 cubic yards per sweeping cycle, which is the equivalent of 600 dump trucks.

Mr. Stubbs asked what problems the maintenance crews encountered prior to the implementation of the NPDES requirements. Mr. Wilson answered that the road crews would frequently respond to flooding problems during the rainy season.

Mr. Even asked if the county has a leaf program. Mr. Wilson stated that the Solid Waste program provides coupons for free leaf-dumping at H&H Wood Recyclers.

Ms. van Breemen asked how far north the sweepers go. Mr. Wilson answered the northernmost point is 259th Street and 10th Ave. and 199th south of Battle Ground for arterials. The maintenance crew sweeps neighborhoods as far north as 179th. Uncurbed rural roads are swept as necessary with a kick-out broom.

Mr. Owen stated that the cost of maintaining and replacing filter vaults at the current rate accounts for less than 1% of the maintenance and operations budget. How many more catch basins, manholes, and drywells will the county need to maintain in the coming years? Mr. Wilson said that growth causes many new additions each year to county responsibility.

Mr. Stubbs asked why filter vaults were put into place to begin with. Mr. Rowell responded that filter vaults are frequently used to add water quality treatment where surface space is an issue (in an already developed area, for instance).

The group discussed technology that might answer the space issue without providing such a maintenance burden on the county. Mr. Even stated that Hancorp has come up with a new technology – a 48” or 60” HDP pipe with 5 different chambers that has been accepted by DOE. Clark County has not accepted it yet.

Mr. Owen asked if the county is trying to project the maintenance and operations budget into the future. Mr. Wilson responded affirmatively. Mr. Owen wondered if the increase in revenue from the stormwater fee each year (as a result of new developments/developed properties in the county) is on pace with the increase in maintenance costs. Mr. Rowell said that he hadn’t compared the two rates.

Maintenance costs are increasing each year due to fuel costs, costs of media for filter vaults, and staffing costs. Mr. Rowell wants to project out 5 years. The next NPDES permit will likely have greater requirements, and it is difficult to forecast the budget without knowing what those requirements will be.

Mr. Crawford asked if the maintenance department has enough equipment and staff to keep up with growth. Mr. Wilson said tentatively yes, but not for too long. Mr. Wilson said the sweeper vehicles are replaced approximately 8 years. The sweeper trucks cost about \$160,000 each.

Mr. Wilson stressed making use of leaf disposal coupons to help sweepers move more efficiently and to keep organic debris from the storm sewer system is a great way for citizens to help the county maintain its storm sewer infrastructure.



Update on Clean Water Program Budget

This is item #7 from the September meeting packet.

Mr. Rowell reviewed the Curtin Creek Enhancement Project, which will capture and treat the stormwater for about 5 square miles of property. The facility will be first come, first serve. There will be an annual maintenance fee. Then Clean Water Program will recover its costs for the facility over approximately ten years. The project will also serve as a stormwater banking effort.

The maintenance for the Curtin Creek project should be less than if each development in the area creates its own small stormwater facility that the county will eventually have to maintain.

Mr. Rowell explained that the Clean Water Program administration costs include costs for Treasurer's Office to bill the Clean Water fee, the annual fee for the NPDES permit to the Department of Ecology, salaries for Mr. Rowell and Ms. Kobluskie.

Update on the Project / Activities Report

This update relates to items 8a-8e from the September packet.

Mr. Rowell reviewed the purpose and format of the Project / Activities Report. Mr. Stubbs asked if the program has been audited. The program was audited internally in 2003.

Update on the Big Board

This update relates to item 9 from the September packet.

The Big Board graphically lists each action and project of the Clean Water Program – the staffing, the budget and status.

Mr. Rowell explained that the program's budget was developed by program element. Each program element represents one of the major foci of the program – capital, monitoring, education, enforcement, maintenance and administration. The budget was not developed by estimating the cost of each individual action within the program elements, therefore, the budget numbers for each individual program on the Big Board are estimates, while the budget numbers for each program element match the official Clean Water Program budget for the 2005-06 biennium.

Mr. Owen asked how often the Big Board is updated. Mr. Rowell said that his goal is to update it two or three times per year.

Mr. Owen asked who the audience for the Big Board is. Mr. Rowell answered that the Board of County Commissioners, citizens, and the Auditor's Office is the audience.

Procedural Changes to Clean Water Commission

Mr. Stubbs stated that the Clean Water Commission will be run a little differently in the future. Commissioners will be asked to accept responsibility for an area of interest. Toward that end, please review the following items prior to the November meeting:



- Clark County Ordinance 13.30A “Clean Water Funding”
- Clean Water Commission Bylaws
- Notes from the meeting between Mr. Stubbs and Mr. Rowell

Mr. Stubbs noted that the Chair will take a more active role in directing the Clean Water Commission meetings. The Commission’s job is to provide advice on stormwater issues to the Board of County Commissioners.

Other Items

Mr. Owen made a motion to approve the September 7, 2005 meeting notes. Ms. van Breemen seconded the motion. The motion was passed by all present Clean Water Commissioners.

Adjourn

The meeting adjourned at 8:45 P.M.

Next Meeting

The next meeting of the Clean Water Commission will be held on Wednesday, November 2, 2005 from 6:30 P.M. – 8:30 P.M. The location is Clark County Public Works Maintenance & Operations Center, 4700 NE 78th Street, Vancouver.

Respectfully Submitted,
Trista Kobluskie

Q:\Outreach_Education\CWC\Meetings\Notes\2005\100505 CWC Meeting Notes.doc

